

REMARKS

102 Rejections

Paragraph 2 of the above referenced office action states that Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Cote et al., U.S. Patent No.5,534,106 (hereafter Cote). Applicants respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 10, 20 and new Claim 21 is not rendered obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103 by Cote.

Specifically, with respect to new Claim 21, Applicants respectfully submit that Cote does not show “using a respective underlying layer in conjunction with the uniform and homogenous overlying layer, wherein the respective underlying layer of each of said plurality of regions is adapted to achieve said hardness effect” as specifically recited. Applicants respectfully assert that Cote does not show using a respective underlying layer in conjunction with a uniform and homogenous overlying layer as claimed in new Claim 21.

With respect to Claim 20, Applicants respectfully submit that Cote does not show “a process specific polishing pad having a plurality of regions configured to achieve specific polishing processes effects when used in a wafer polishing machine” as specifically recited. Applicants respectfully assert that Cote does not show an overlying layer “...being uniform and homogenous across a polishing surface of said overlying layer...” as Claimed. Cote does not show a polishing surface of a polishing pad “...having a plurality of regions, each of said plurality of regions configured to achieve a specific process effect such that specific polishing effect can be achieved on said wafer by selectively moving said wafer frictionally one of said plurality of regions...” and further, does not

show “each of said plurality of regions having a respective underlying layer adapted to achieve said specific process effect”. Applicant do not understand Cote to show underlying layers having different hardness beneath a uniform homogenous overlying layer. As explicitly claimed, the polishing surface of the present invention has an overlying layer providing a uniform homogenous quality across the area of its polishing surface.

Applicants respectfully submit that Cote does not show a polishing pad having a combined first and second layers, the underlying layer having differing hardness beneath a uniform homogenous overlying layer as a single polishing pad. (Emphasis added) As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in dependent Claims 9 and 17 is not shown, suggested, or rendered obvious by Cote.

Further, Applicants respectfully assert that claimed limitations describing the first and second underlying layers “having differing amounts of thickness when said wafer is frictionally moved against said polishing pad” to achieve the specific polishing effect are not shown by Cote. Applicants respectfully submit that underlying layers having different thickness as claimed is not shown or suggested by Cote.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed new Claim 21 and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected Claims. Applicants respectfully submit that all claims overcome the rejections based on Cote. Accordingly, Applicants submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO

Dated: 8/8/, 2001



Glenn Barnes
Registration No. 42,293
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060